

REMARKS

Claims 20-25 have been amended and remain pending for reexamination.

35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 20-25 have been amended to change the language which the Examiner did not find support for, i.e. "storing analysis information obtained by syntax analysis of said source program" to -storing analysis information resulting from header analysis of said header--. Further, claims 20-25 have been amended to refer to analysis information obtained by --said header analysis-- rather than "said syntax analysis", which was also pointed out in the Office Action for lacking support. As amended, claims 20-25 comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph and therefore Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn without admitting to the propriety of the rejection.

In particular, Applicants note that the claims are supported by pages 16 and 17 of the specification and Fig. 9. For example, see page 16, line 23 to page 17, line 11 which discloses that the header part 9013 holds the version of the

compiler when the procedures were compiled and the level of optimization in the compile process that was carried out.

Fig. 9 shows the structure of the object program file 112 having the header 9013. Accordingly, the specification and drawings of the application as originally filed support the pending claims in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The amendments made to claim 21 discussed above also place claim 21 in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claim 23 has been amended to overcome the claim objection kindly noted by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Request for New Office Action

Applicants filed a Request for New Office Action on November 4, 2004. Applicants withdraw the Request for New Office Action since a review of the file shows that the reference "The Stabs Debug Format" of Menapace et al (1993)

was in fact listed on the PTO-892 form supplied to Applicants as an attachment to the Office Action mailed October 6, 2004.

Priority

Applicants filed the certified copy of the priority document with the Amendment of June 30, 2004. Enclosed is a date stamped mailroom receipt showing that the certified copy of the priority document was filed. An acknowledgment of receipt of the certified copy would be appreciated.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants contend that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and reexamination is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



John R. Mattingly
Registration No. 30,293
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: March 7, 2005